

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action mailed March 14, 2008.  
All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-5, and 30-64 are in the case.

No new Claims were added.

Claims 30, 31, 33, 38-40, 44, 46, 51-53, 59 and 64 were amended to better claim the invention.

No Claims were cancelled.

**Request for Interview**

The undersigned respectfully requests a telephonic interview with the Examiner after the Examiner has had an opportunity to consider this Amendment, but before the issuance of the next Office Action. The undersigned may be reached at 617-951-2500.

At Paragraph 7 of the Office Action the Specification was objected to as not providing antecedent basis for "computer readable media". Amendment of the claim is believed to satisfy this objection.

At Paragraphs 8-9 Claims 31, 39-44, and 52-57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C.  
101. Amendment of the claims is believed to satisfy this rejection.

The examiner raised the question of a “useful, concrete, and tangible results”.

Applicant respectfully notes that representative Claim 1 set forth:

*inserting, by the proxy, metadata into the file handle; and  
sending, by the proxy, the file handle with the metadata inserted in the file handle to the client, the metadata to be used in sending, by the proxy, the file handle with the metadata inserted in the file handle to the client, to identify the client and the indicated file.*

Applicant respectfully urges that *inserting, by the proxy, metadata into the file handle* is a concrete result in which metadata is written into a *file handle*, and then *sending, by the proxy, the file handle with the metadata inserted in the file handle to the client* is a concrete result requiring transmission of data over a computer network, as described in the Specification.

Further, then using the metadata in *sending, by the proxy, the file handle with the metadata inserted in the file handle to the client* for the purpose *to identify the client and the indicated file*. is another useful, concrete, and tangible result.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully urges that all claims satisfy all requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, including the “useful, concrete, and tangible results” requirement of all sections of 35 U.S.C.

At Paragraphs 10-11 of the Office Action Claims 30-31, 33, 39-44, 40, 46, 51-57, 59, and 64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Amendment of the claims is believed to satisfy this rejection.

At Paragraphs 12-13 Claims 1-2, 4-5, 30-34, 36-40, 42-47, 49-53, 56-60, and 62-64 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chandrashekar et al. U. S. Patent Publication 2005 / 00 33 988 A1, (hereinafter Chandrashekar).

Applicant’s claimed novel invention, as set out in representative Claim 1, comprises in part:

I. (Previously Presented) A method for establishing identity in a file system, comprising:

receiving a file request concerning an indicated file from a client, the request received by a proxy;

forwarding the request from the proxy to a file server;

returning a reply associated with the file request from the file server to the proxy;

*inserting, by the proxy, metadata into the file handle; and  
sending, by the proxy, the file handle with the metadata inserted in the file handle to the client, the metadata to be used in further requests to identify the client and the indicated file.*

Chandrasekhar discloses adding information to a header of to a file on a “file by file basis”. Chandrasekhar Par. 55, Page 3.

Applicant respectfully urges that Chandrasekhar has no disclosure of applicant’s claimed

*inserting, by the proxy, metadata into the file handle; and  
sending, by the proxy, the file handle with the metadata inserted in the file handle to the client, the metadata to be used in further requests to identify the client and the indicated file.*

Further, Applicant respectfully urges that Chandrasekhar has no disclosure concerning a “file handle”.

Even further, Applicant respectfully urges that Chandrasekhar has no disclosure of modifying a file handle, as claimed by Applicant in representative Claim 1 as *inserting, by the proxy, metadata into the file handle.*

Still further, Applicant claims using the metadata inserted in the file handle, as *sending, by the proxy, the file handle with the metadata inserted in the file handle to the client, the metadata to be used in further requests to identify the client and the indicated file*, and Chandrasekhar has no disclosure of modifying a file handle, and then using the modified file handle.

In addition, Chandrasekhar, in his Specification, has only one reference to a “file name”, and that is at his Paragraph 47. The usage by Chandrasekhar at his Paragraph 47 indicates that he means only a fixed “file name” which is not modified. Applicant claims modifying the file handle, and Chandrasekhar has no disclosure of this concept as claimed by Applicant.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully urges that Chandrasekhar is legally insufficient to anticipate Applicant’s claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. 102 because of the absence from Chandrasekhar of any disclosure of Applicant’s claimed novel

*inserting, by the proxy, metadata into the file handle; and*

*sending, by the proxy, the file handle with the metadata inserted in the file handle to the client, the metadata to be used in further requests to identify the client and the indicated file.*

At Paragraphs 14-16 of the Office Action, Claims 3, 35, 41, 48, 54-55, and 61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chandrasekhar in view of Ohazama U. S. Patent 7,225,207.

Applicant respectfully notes that Claims 3, 35, 41, 48, 54-55, and 61 are all dependent claims, and these dependent claims are dependent from independent claims which are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, claims 3, 35, 41, 48, 54-55, and 61 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

All independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

All dependent claims are believed to be dependent from allowable independent claims, and therefore in condition for allowance.

Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,

/A. Sidney Johnston/  
A. Sidney Johnston  
Reg. No. 29,548  
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP  
88 Black Falcon Avenue  
Boston, MA 02210-2414  
(617) 951-2500